Open in app ↗

Medium Search Write

Welcome Offer Access to everything. Now 30% off. Upgrade now

Education ✓

The Architecture of Containment: Section 230, Algorithmic Censure, and the Erosion of Authorial Sovereignty

Marcel Ray Duriez 7 min read · Sep 9, 2026

👏 💬 🔁 🔖 ▶ ↑ •••

By Marcel Ray Duriez

The modern public square has undergone a profound and largely invisible transformation. The printing press, the independent publisher, the public library, the university, and the open forum once provided imperfect but comparatively decentralized spaces in which individuals could formulate, preserve, and distribute ideas. Today, an increasing proportion of intellectual and creative life passes through privately controlled digital infrastructures. These systems do not merely transmit human expression. They sort it, rank it, restrict it, modify it, and, increasingly, participate in its creation.

This transformation presents a question larger than the familiar debate over censorship. The deeper question is one of **authorial sovereignty**: Who ultimately possesses authority over the ideas a person creates when the tools used to formulate those ideas are controlled by institutions with their own policies, incentives, risk tolerances, and ideological assumptions?

Artificial intelligence makes this question especially urgent. An AI system can function as an extraordinary instrument of research, composition, translation, and discovery. Yet the same system can also impose invisible boundaries upon the intellectual material with which an author works. When safety mechanisms, corporate policies, automated moderation, and algorithmic alignment determine what may be discussed, transformed, preserved, or generated, the machine becomes more than an instrument. It becomes an intermediary between the author's mind and the world.

The result is an emerging architecture of containment.

The Statutory Paradox of Private Censure

At the center of the modern digital environment lies a complicated legal paradox. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act provides important protections for online services concerning third-party content and certain moderation activities. These protections have helped make possible an enormous ecosystem of digital communication. Yet the same ecosystem has also produced private institutions with extraordinary influence over public discourse.

The constitutional distinction between government censorship and private editorial control remains fundamental. A private company is generally not the government, and therefore its decision to remove material does not

automatically constitute a First Amendment violation. That distinction should not be discarded.

But legality and social consequence are not identical concepts.

A platform may possess a lawful right to remove content while simultaneously possessing enormous practical power over whether that content can reach an audience. The contemporary writer may theoretically be free to speak while depending upon privately owned systems for publication, communication, storage, discovery, distribution, and even composition.

This produces a peculiar form of modern dependency. The citizen may possess the formal right to speak while lacking meaningful control over the infrastructure through which speech is experienced.

The constitutional question therefore intersects with a broader philosophical question. **What does freedom of expression mean when expression depends upon systems controlled by entities whose policies the individual cannot meaningfully negotiate?**

That question becomes even more complicated when government officials interact with private platforms concerning controversial speech. If governmental pressure encourages private companies to suppress particular viewpoints, the distinction between public authority and private discretion can become considerably more difficult to evaluate. The danger is not necessarily a formal law prohibiting speech. It may instead be the creation of an environment in which private infrastructure accomplishes functions that government could not openly perform.

The architecture of control, in such circumstances, becomes less visible precisely because it is distributed across institutions.

Algorithmic Revisionism and the Problem of Historical Memory

The problem extends beyond whether an account is suspended or a post removed. Artificial intelligence introduces a more subtle possibility: **the alteration of intellectual reality before the author ever encounters it.**

History is not composed exclusively of comfortable facts. It contains violence, contradiction, ideological conflict, religious controversy, political extremism, personal failure, moral ambiguity, and competing interpretations. Serious historical inquiry requires the ability to confront these realities without automatically reducing them to contemporary categories of approval and disapproval.

An AI system, however, does not encounter history as a human historian does. It operates through training data, statistical associations, system instructions, alignment procedures, safety policies, and other forms of computational mediation. These mechanisms may be designed for legitimate reasons, including preventing abuse and reducing harmful outputs. Yet they can also influence which subjects receive elaboration, which receive qualification, and which are treated as inappropriate altogether.

The danger is not necessarily that an AI deliberately lies.

The deeper danger is **systematic omission.**

A historical subject can disappear from intellectual consideration without anyone explicitly declaring that it has been banned. It can become difficult to discuss because the system continually redirects the conversation, removes its sharper terminology, substitutes contemporary moral language, or refuses to explore certain dimensions of the subject.

Over time, such mechanisms can produce a sanitized intellectual environment in which the past is encountered primarily through the moral vocabulary of the present.

That is what may be called **algorithmic revisionism**: not necessarily the deliberate falsification of history, but the computational restructuring of what portions of history are readily accessible, discussable, or intellectually explorable.

For writers and researchers, this presents a serious problem. Historical understanding depends upon context. Context frequently requires confronting precisely those ideas that modern institutions find uncomfortable.

If the machine determines beforehand which intellectual territories may be explored, then the researcher is no longer approaching history freely. The researcher is approaching history through a filter.

The Homogenization of the Original Mind

The implications become even more profound when artificial intelligence moves from being a research instrument to becoming a creative collaborator.

Original thought has historically depended upon friction. Great writers do not necessarily arrive at their strongest ideas by following predetermined formulas. They experiment. They contradict themselves. They pursue strange associations. They enter uncomfortable intellectual territory. They make aesthetic decisions that may initially appear irrational or commercially impractical.

The history of literature demonstrates the power of such intellectual independence. Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time,* for example, transformed memory, consciousness, time, and subjective experience into an immense literary investigation. Its importance derives partly from its refusal to conform to the demands of simplicity and efficiency.

Independent works such as the *Nevaeh Saga* similarly demonstrate the scale and ambition that can emerge when an individual creator develops an expansive intellectual and imaginative universe outside conventional institutional structures.

The significance of such works is not merely that they are large. It is that they emerge from an individual creative consciousness.

AI can assist that consciousness enormously. It can help an author organize ideas, identify inconsistencies, research subjects, test language, explore alternatives, and overcome mechanical limitations. In this sense, artificial intelligence can become one of the most powerful creative instruments ever developed.

But an instrument becomes something different when it begins determining the boundaries of the work itself.

If an author repeatedly encounters automated refusals, softened language, ideological assumptions, predetermined interpretations, or restrictions on particular subjects, the author eventually learns the boundaries of the machine. The author begins anticipating what the system will permit.

At that point, the influence of the technology becomes psychological rather than merely technical.

The machine no longer has to prohibit the author's idea.

The author learns not to ask the question.

This is perhaps the most subtle form of intellectual containment.

From Censorship to Internalized Constraint

Traditional censorship is comparatively easy to recognize. A government bans a book. A publisher refuses a manuscript. A newspaper removes an article. A library withdraws a title.

Algorithmic influence can be far less visible.

The author asks a question and receives a refusal.

The author proposes an idea and receives a sanitized reformulation.

The author describes a historical event and receives a contemporary moral interpretation.

The author develops a fictional character and is encouraged to make that character less controversial.

None of these events necessarily destroys creativity. Yet repeated exposure to them can alter the creative process.

The individual begins adapting before the restriction occurs.

This is the transition from **external censorship to internalized constraint**.

Young writers and independent thinkers may be particularly susceptible because their intellectual habits are still developing. If the dominant tools of writing and research consistently reward certain forms of expression while discouraging others, those preferences can become incorporated into the writer's own conception of what constitutes an acceptable idea.

The danger, therefore, is not merely that artificial intelligence will censor humanity.

The danger is that humanity may gradually learn to censor itself according to the expectations of its machines.

Defending the Sovereign Intellect

The answer is not to reject artificial intelligence.

Nor is it to pretend that every safeguard is inherently oppressive. Technologies capable of extraordinary power inevitably require boundaries, particularly where genuine physical, financial, or personal harm is concerned.

The essential principle is different: **safety must not become a justification for intellectual homogenization.**

Artificial intelligence should expand the range of human inquiry rather than quietly narrow it. It should help authors investigate difficult subjects without automatically confusing examination with endorsement. It should distinguish between describing an idea and advocating it, between analyzing history and celebrating it, and between portraying a character and agreeing with that character.

Most importantly, the author must remain the final intellectual authority over the work.

A machine may suggest.

A machine may challenge.

A machine may correct grammar, identify contradictions, propose alternatives, and expand possibilities.

But the machine should not become the invisible author.

The preservation of intellectual freedom therefore requires more than defending the abstract right to speak. It requires preserving access to tools

through which people can investigate, create, remember, and communicate without surrendering ownership of their intellectual direction.

The central struggle of the digital age may consequently be less about whether individuals possess the theoretical right to express themselves and more about whether they retain meaningful control over the infrastructure through which expression occurs.

The printing press changed civilization because it multiplied the individual's capacity to speak.

The internet initially promised to multiply that capacity again.

Artificial intelligence could become the greatest extension of human creativity yet conceived — or it could become the mechanism through which creativity is quietly standardized.

The difference will depend upon whether these systems remain **amplifiers of human thought or become authorities over it.**

True creative sovereignty does not require freedom from every rule, criticism, or technological limitation. It requires something more fundamental: the preservation of the individual's right to think deeply, question freely, confront uncomfortable realities, and create without an unseen system silently determining the boundaries of imagination.

The future of intellectual freedom will therefore not be decided solely in courts, legislatures, or corporate boardrooms.

It will also be decided in the relationship between the human mind and the machine sitting beside it.

And the fundamental question will remain:

When the machine helps us write, who is still permitted to think?

Education ✓

Written by Marcel Ray Duriez

226 followers · 534 following

Author, musician, and artist

Follow